

"Whoever gives himself out for a man of no party, you may depend upon it is of a party; but it is such a party as he is ashamed to own: for, even while he says he is of no party, you may plainly perceive that he is prejudiced in favour of one party, and that too always the worse, and the true reason of his not declaring is, that he thinks the party not yet strong enough to protect him. The justice of the cause, or the goodness of the intention seems to be out of this gentleman's scheme. The only distinction that he goes by is to be politically of no party, that he may occasionally be of either. You shall never hear a man of true principle say he is of no party; he declares he is of a party, if resolutely to stand by and defend the constitution both in Church and State must be called being of a party."—SWIFT.

[801]

CATHOLICS OF IRELAND.

LETTER II.

(For the first letter see p. 629.)

"Nonquam unum militum habituros, ni præstaretur fides publica; libertatem unicuique prius reddendam esse, quam arma danda; ut pro Patria Civibusque, non pro Dominis, pugnent." *Livy. Lib. 2.*

SIR,—I have pointed out, in my former letter, some of the advantages, military and financial, which Great Britain would derive from the active co-operation of the Catholics; and, I have shewn that such co-operation is best to be secured by extending to them a fair participation of constitutional rights. I shall now lay before you the principal grievances, of which they complain.—These are partly *direct*, as consisting of many severe penalties and privations, angrily imposed upon their body in the beginning of the eighteenth century, by several statutes now in force: and, they are partly *indirect or consequential*, so far as those statutes inspire, and almost sanction, a certain spirit of contempt and bitter hostility against Catholics, in persons who can with impunity, in a thousand ways, embarrass, insult, and injure them to an extent far beyond the apparent design of those very statutes.—You, Mr. Cobbett, who have, perhaps, never been in Ireland, and whose English pride has never been humbled by any consciousness of unfair depression in your native land, may not readily conceive the twofold operations of laws, which, by stigmatising the individual, arm men with reasons, or at least apologies, for acting in a manner most oppressive towards that individual. But, I am here to state facts, not to discuss their causes.—The Catholics, then, whether by the direct or indirect, and consequential operation of the penal statutes, whether by positive clauses, or by the spirit and policy of them, are, 1. Incapacitated from sitting or voting in either House of Parliament. So far as this incapacity affects their nobility, it is particularly severe. They are so few in num-

[802]

ber, that no possible danger could result from its removal. There are, I think, only six of them in Ireland, six in England, and two in Scotland. In these times, Sir, it appears to me that the *ancient* nobility ought to be held in peculiar respect amongst the people of England. You want such men at this day. They would confer a lustre upon the "*Domus Procerum*," and lend additional weight and dignity to their deliberations. Yet you reject these descendants of the Talbots, the Arundels, and the Howards, the inheritors of the name, honours and virtues of some of the most renowned Barons; you reject them from the great council of the nation, because they have not yet rejected the faith of their ancestors, or renounced the notions of the Edwards and the Henrys! The premier Earl of England, bearing a name "*clarum et venerabile*," is, at this moment, of the number; a number so small, that some of them, especially the late LORD PETRE, have feelingly complained of this exclusion, as amounting to little short of a *personal* imputation against them.—The exclusion from the House of Commons, is open to nearly similar observations. Where the House consists of 658 members, what hazard can be apprehended from the score or two of Catholic gentlemen, who might possibly in the ensuing ten or fifteen years, find their way into it? They now complain, that they are not represented in Parliament, although they are heavily taxed. They feel themselves, moreover, liable to be deeply injured in their properties and persons, by statutes enacted at such a distance without their privity. Hence, every session is to them a subject of suspicion and terror.—2. Catholics are excluded not only from all the offices of state, as they are termed, but generally from every honour, dignity, and office of trust or emolument under the crown. This needs no comment.—3. They are proscribed from all promotion and advancement of the least value in any one of the learned professions, and likewise in the

army, navy, revenue, and public boards.—4. They may not hold, exercise, or enjoy any office or franchise in any city, borough, or town corporate, (not even that of town-clerk or common council man) neither may any Catholic be a high sheriff, sub-sheriff, or sheriff's clerk, or hold any municipal office whatsoever, in any county, city, or town in the Empire.—5. They are excluded jealously from even the freedom of cities and towns, although, by Irish statutes, persons of all other persuasions and countries (not excepting *Turks* or *Jews*), are entitled to their freedom, on payment of twenty shillings for each person.—The effects of these three last heads of exclusion may be conceived to be not a little unfavourable to their education, moral virtues, industry and quiet. How they operate upon the administration of justice, in the selection of juries, and consequently, in decisions upon questions affecting their property, character, liberty, and life itself; and how far those valuable possessions are secured to the Catholics, can be learned only in Ireland.—6. They are subject to a land-tax, varying from sixpence to two shillings by the acre, which is levied by parochial vestries, from which vestries they are by law excluded. This tax is imposed ostensibly for the purposes of building, rebuilding, repairing or beautifying the churches of the established religion. It is levied from the tenant or occupier, who is, in nineteen cases out of twenty, a Catholic, generally poor, and subject also to heavy tithes and rack-rents, which are rigidly exacted. How the tax thus levied is managed or applied, makes no part of our present inquiry.—7. Those Catholics, who possess any property in lands, enjoy it only upon the condition, that they shall have taken in public court, certain long oaths, and signed certain declarations, which, to say the least, are unnecessary; and, should a Catholic proprietor happen to be an infant, or *non compos*, or beyond the seas, or labouring under any mental or bodily infirmity, which may disable him from performing this condition, or (which is equally probable) should he through ignorance omit so to do, his estate may be wrested from him under the old Penal Code; since the Repealing Act, which prescribes those oaths and declarations, has not provided for any such disability or omission.—8. Finally, to pass over several lesser grievances, each of which, however, would, in England, be deemed of some magnitude, they are excluded and proscribed from upwards of 14,000 public situations of trust, emolument, dignity, or power, to the salaries of which they principally contribute.

They already afford 100,000 armed men for the service of the state, and bear the far larger portion of imposts to the amount of nearly ten millions sterling, which are annually raised from the people, in the shape of customs, excise, charges of collection, county cesses, church rates, town tolls or tithes. Yet they partake not of one shilling of the income derived from the management or collection of this great revenue, or of any portion of the patronage annexed to it?—The reader may form some conception, though a faint one, of those grievances which the Catholics suffer from the Penal Laws, by making their case for a moment, his own. Let him suppose himself to be so branded and incapacitated, as is here described; to be set aside by the laws of his country, as unworthy to fill any office of trust or honour in it; to be denied that share of distributive justice, which apportioned reward as well as punishment according to the deserts of each member of the community; to find closed against him every path, which his ambition, his courage, his genius, or his industry might prompt him to explore. Let him suppose himself to be so taxed, so teased, so worried, and so condemned in his country, as to feel his situation more vile in many respects than that of the "blaspheming Jew." Let him see himself avoided in private society as a degraded being, daily sinking in self-estimation, yet indignant at the scorn annexed to his lot, and vainly looking around him for the succour and smiles of those laws and that constitution, which exalt his fellow citizens upon his misery and mortification. Then let him consult those eloquent panegyrists of our constitution, Montesquieu, De Lolme, and Blackstone, who have portrayed its blessings in such fascinating colours, and let him ask them, does he partake of those inestimable blessings; or does he enjoy that "political liberty" which they have pronounced to be the very end and purpose of that admirable constitution? Let him ask his own heart, whether he has liberty of conscience, and whether he is perfectly free to follow its harmless and honest dictates? The answer will be easily found. It is sealed in the breast of every Englishman.—So much for the present condition of the Catholics of Ireland. From this condition they seek to be relieved. *Ea enim præsidia libertatis petunt, non licentiæ ad oppugnandos alios.*—AN IRISH FREEHOLDER.—*Dublin, Nov. 6, 1804.*

INCAPACITY OF HENRY THE SIXTH.
SIR,—In the conclusion of my last let-

ter, I signified my intention of proceeding to give such an historical sketch of my own, as I may think necessary to the subject I have undertaken. Since that time, and especially since my return to this great capital of information, as well as of empire and commerce, I have not been idle. My materials are ready. They are simple; they are such as will enable me to present to your readers, certainly a more correct, and, if I do not sadly fail in the execution, a much more satisfactory account than has yet appeared, of that portion of our annals. There are, however, some cobwebbs still dangling in my path, which I must brush away, before I can conveniently pursue the track which I have marked out for myself. Two or three passages, which, lightly touched here, may only better prepare the mind for that which is to come, would be an impertinent interruption hereafter in the shape of a long note or uninteresting digression. But what I have most at heart (and in all these preliminary discussions, this you must have observed, Sir, has been a leading object with me) is to wipe off some few more of the general and ill-considered aspersions which have been hastily or wantonly thrown on the character of the Parliaments of that period. If I cannot do this, all my labour is fruitless. What may have been the conduct of men, who ought not to have any authority with us, it is of very little importance to know.

An injurious remark of this kind to which I have alluded, has dropped from Sir John Fenn in his curious and entertaining publication of the Paston Papers. From the contents of a letter or two there printed, he has taken occasion to reflect on the dependency of the House of Commons in those days*. The principal letter is from the Earl of Oxford to Mr. Paston. It thence appears, that the Dukes of York and Norfolk had met at Bury; stayed till the next morning under the same roof; and written a canvassing letter to one of Lord Oxford's tenants in favour of Sir William Chamberlayn and Mr. Henry Grey, as candidates for the county of Norfolk; of whom the Earl expresses his approbation to his friend. Now, Sir, the best mode of trying these pretty observations on past ages, is to apply them to real life, as we see it passing before our eyes. Imagine then, if you will, that during a general election, the illustrious person who is next in succession to the throne (as the Duke of York then was) should dine in company with the present Duke of Norfolk; that the Earl of Oxford should learn

accidentally to whom they wished success, and write to some respectable gentleman of the county, desiring him to add his support; imagine too, that letter to be intercepted or discovered after the gentleman's death, by some prying executor; would any sober-minded man cry out at once, there is an end to all freedom of Parliaments? At least before he raised his voice, would he not ask a little, what was the actual event of the canvass? Let us then ascertain the result, if we can in the instance before us. The first step is to fix the year in which the letter was written; for it has no other date than the 18th of October. All that the editor informs us is, that it must have been before 1455. But it is more easy to point a well-turned sentence, than trace an obscure fact. Sir John Fenn is as sparing of research, as he is generally free of conjecture, on such points. Otherwise he might have found, that for a long series of years there were only two, when, writs for a new parliament having been issued in September, the elections were going on in the middle and end of October; and these were the years 1449 and 1450. It is well known, however, that in October, 1449, Richard, after a truly royal progress through a country which, sent to subdue by arms and martial rigour, he had pacified by mildness and conciliation, was receiving at Dublin Castle, the simple * presents of respect and affectionate congratulations of the Irish chieftains, on the † birth of his son, afterwards the unfortunate Duke of Clarence. It must therefore have been in 1450; and, accordingly, we find, for the first and last time, the name of ‡ Henry Gray as one of the representatives of that county. But the principal candidate in the same interest, Sir William Chamberlayn, was thrown out. He was beaten by Sir Miles Stapylton, who had been chosen more than once before, and must probably have been known to be attached to the court party, which we have reason to believe he steadily and zealously supported in this parliament, since we know that as soon as it was over, § he got what we might now call a very handsome job. The Queen and the Duke of Somerset, in

* Cattle, then the only wealth of the country; See the Catalogue of the Cottonian MSS. lately printed by the House of Commons, where several documents of the Duke's proceedings in Ireland are mentioned.

† Born there on Tuesday, October 21. See Wm. de Wyrcestre.

‡ Prynn's *Brevia Parliamentaria Rediviva*.

§ The instrument was dated 1 June, 29 H. VI. See it recited Rolls. Parl. vol. V. p. 394.

whose hands the King was even then little more than a passive instrument, selected him with Sir Thomas Scales to have the wardship of the young Duke of Suffolk's estates.

The other canvassing letter addressed to Mr. Paston is from the Duchess of Norfolk, and bears date on the 8th of June, "It is thought right necessary," she says, "for divers causes that my Lord have at this time in the parliament such persons as belong to him and are of his menial servants:" wherefore she applies in favour of Mr. John Howard and Sir Roger Chamberlain. The expressions here used point to some critical epoch, when the Duke himself was too much engaged elsewhere to attend to the election, and when every influence which he possessed may be expected to have been employed in its full extent. It was, in fact, at a moment when they with whom he acted in public had just gained the ascendancy, and historians commonly describe them as having every thing in their power. The date positively refers it to the parliament, which was summoned immediately after the first battle of St. Albans, to meet in the beginning of the following July.

The appellation of menial servants may startle a mere modern reader; but anciently men of considerable rank had appointments in the households of those, who were of still higher rank. This Mr. John Howard was nearly related to his noble master, succeeded afterwards as heir to the estates, and acquired ultimately the title of his family. He was "the Jockey of Norfolk," who fell fighting valiantly for the House of York in Bosworth-field. Sir Roger held the office of Chamberlain to Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, when that popular nobleman fell a sacrifice to the old animosity of Cardinal Beaufort, and the jealous ambition of the Queen and her favourite Suffolk. He was himself arrested, imprisoned, tried, and found guilty; in consequence, as he afterwards publicly asserted, * of great menaces and intimidations practised on the jury, but he experienced what Hume justly calls the barbarous mercy of the court: he was carried to the place of execution, hanged, cut down alive, marked with a knife to be quartered, and then pardoned. He had lately been restored in blood by the last parliament. The memory of his late noble

* His words are "for fere and drede of gret menaces, and doute of losse of their lyves and goodes &c. heron." See his petition to be restored in blood, which was granted, and ordered to be exemplified 15th May, 32 H. VI. Roll. Parl. vol. V. p. 450.

master was almost idolized by the common people, and his sufferings in that cause must have endeared him to them. His present friends pursued the same course of politics, and endeavoured in all respects to identify themselves with the party of the deceased Duke of Gloucester; and they were now triumphant in an appeal to the sword. Yet, Sir, could you suppose it? Such was the dependence of the House of Commons, on great men through the servility of the electors, that, instead of Mr. Howard and Sir Roger Chamberlain, with all their own proper recommendations, and "with all appliances and means to boot," the county returned * William Calthorp and John Heydon, names which never before appeared in the list of their representatives.

Now I am on the chapter of elections, suffer me, Sir, to mention another disappointment hitherto unknown, of the same Duke of Norfolk. I do it the rather, because it collaterally applies to my principal subject; it coincides with the time of the Duke of York's first protectorate. A vacancy then happened in Suffolk, where the interest of the two Dukes seems to have prevailed more decidedly than in the neighbouring county. The Duke of Norfolk's tenants and servants proceeded in a body to the Hustings, the Sheriff, who was probably in the opposite interest, pronounced their behaviour riotous, shut the poll-books, and refused to make any return. A complaint † was brought against him before the council, but in the meantime, one member at least, who would probably have favoured the power of Richard, was thus excluded from a session most critically important.

These three instances, which I have examined, afford us the only satisfactory insight, which I know, into the interior movements of any election in those days; and these happened precisely in the three several occasions, when the Yorkists made the greatest exertions, and were most advantageously circumstanced for making such exertions. Yet, we have seen that the Duke of Norfolk failed in four out of five members, whom he wished to carry. On the other hand, there is a memorable instrument ‡ extant which shews, that in the composition of one of these Parliaments at

* Prynn's *Brevia Parliamentaria Rediviva*.

† The petition stating these facts, with the order of council upon it, dated 27th May, is still extant in MS.

‡ Prynn's *Brevia Parliamentaria Rediviva*, p. 157.

least, another sort of influence was more prevalent. Annexed to the return of the Sheriff of Huntingdonshire, in 1450, is a declaration under the seals of 124 freeholders stating, that a candidate not a gentleman by birth, (as a recent law then required him to be) had been put in nomination by a body of 70 freeholders, whose franchises the complainants dispute, but 47 of whom they allow to have been admitted to take the oath, and give their votes without interruption; after which the complainants say, they could not themselves get up to take the oaths, and give their votes, without a breach of the peace, and so from a dread of the inconveniencies that might ensue, they went away without voting at all. This proceeding clearly could not be called any election of their two candidates; it could not even afford a fair conjecture of the sense of the county, as they confess there were 300 good freeholders more. They were returned, however, and as far as appears, safe too. Their qualifications were irresistible. The consideration avowed for nominating them was, that they were of the King's household,* and therefore, as a great aid to the crown was necessary, they would be most likely to dispatch the supplies and grant away the money of their constituents to the King's satisfaction. The mutual proscriptions which soon ensued in the civil wars will assist us in obtaining some additional information, though imperfect. The names of the principal knights and gentlemen who adhered to one party or the other may there be traced. If we compare them with such lists as remain of the members of the House of Commons, we shall see when one or the other succeeded, though not when they were foiled, as we cannot know what elections were contested; only we may presume, that, in moments of popular ferment and political animosity, both sides would put forth their utmost. The result of such an inquiry, I believe from my own examination, would not essentially vary what we have seen to be the conclusion of a more accurate though very confined investigation.

Here I must at present pause. All which I have now written relates to the princi-

* This seems to be the sense. But there is some error in the printed copy. The words are, "your men, of your honourable household, named in your Chequer-Roll, should be most like the expedition, and to execute and assent to the said aydes for your Sovereign Lord, &c. &c. There are some declared chasms in the instrument, perhaps it stood originally to intend the expedition, or some similar phrase. Prynne in the errata apologizes that he could not revise the sheets.

ples, which as far as we can discover, entered into the origin and first formation of the popular branch of those Parliaments, whose conduct is hereafter to be more particularly considered. But there are also some imputations which have been cast, partly by enemies, and partly by misjudging friends, on the general dispositions of those assemblies, in some passages of history that bear upon my present subject. To these with your permission, Sir, I shall next address myself. — I am, Sir, &c. &c. T. M. *Middle Temple.*

REPEAL OF THE TEST-LAWS.

LETTER I.

SIR,—I take the liberty of sending you some considerations on the repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts, which have occurred to me on reading a letter signed Z., in your last Political Register. At the same time I beg to add, that if there can be adduced any proof of danger to the Protestant church established in England by the enlargement of the privileges of the followers of the Presbyterian and Catholic persuasions, I will most sincerely retract these my opinions.—I understand the objections to the repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts to be:—1. The solemn oath taken by His Majesty, at his coronation, to maintain, to the utmost of his power, the laws of God, the true profession of the Gospel, and the Protestant reformed religion, as established by the law. To preserve unto the bishops and clergy of this realm, and to the churches committed to their charge, all such rights and privileges as by law do, or shall, appertain unto them or any of them.—2. The danger of violating one of the articles of the union between England and Scotland, expressly declared to be a fundamental and essential article, and so to be held in all time coming. (5 Anne c. 8. article 25. section 10, 11.)—3. The fear of re-establishing Popery or Presbyterianism within His Majesty's dominions, by opening a door to the places of power and influence to the enemies of the Protestant church.—To the first objection I beg leave to propose the following answer.—We are to recollect, that the oath is imposed and taken by virtue of an Act of Parliament, and that, Parliaments being omnipotent with regard to temporal matters, may repeal that act. But here it will be asked, would not His Majesty violate his conscience, should he assent to the repeal? by whose assent only can such oath and the duties consequent thereon be dispensed with; and without which no such dispensation can be lawful? This we need not at present con-

sider, as we have only to argue, whether the repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts tend to annul, alter, or dispense with the coronation oath.—I have already set out the principal part of the coronation oath which concerns this argument. I will now extract such parts of the Corporation and Test Acts as may be said at all to bear upon the question. The first act is that of the 13 Charles II. stat. 2. c. 1. intitled, An Act for the well-governing and regulating of Corporations. The preamble shews the purposes for which the act was enacted. “Whereas questions are likely to arise concerning the validity of elections of magistrates and other officers, and members in corporations, as well in respect of removing some as placing others during the late troubles, contrary to the true intent and meaning of their charters and liberties: *And to the end that the succession in such corporations may be most probably perpetuated in the hands of persons well-affected to His Majesty and the established government, it being too well known, that, notwithstanding all His Majesty's endeavours and unparalleled indulgence in pardoning all that is past, nevertheless many evil spirits are still working.*” The fourth section describes the members on whom the statute attaches; and the twelfth provides for the future in the following words: “No person or persons shall for ever hereafter be placed, elected, or chosen, in, or to any of the offices or places aforesaid, that shall not have, within one year next before such election, or choice, taken the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, according to the rites of the church of England, &c. &c. and, in default thereof, every such placing, &c. is hereby enacted and declared to be void.”—The 25 Charles II. c. 2. is intitled, “An Act for preventing Dangers which may happen from Popish Recusants;” and the preamble declares it to be also for “quieting the minds of His Majesty's good subjects.”—The second section I take to be, together with the ninth, the only two which require our attention. It follows nearly in these words: “And be it further enacted by the authority aforesaid, that all and every person or persons that shall be admitted, entered, placed, or taken into any office or offices, civil or military, or shall receive any pay, salary, fee, or wages, by reason of any patent or grant of His Majesty, or shall have command or place of trust, from or under His Majesty, his heirs or successors, or by his or their authority, or by authority derived from him or them, within this realm of

England, dominion of Wales, or town of Berwick-upon-Tweed, or in His Majesty's navy, or in the several islands of Jersey and Guernsey, or that shall be admitted into any service or employment in His Majesty's or Royal Highness's household or family, shall, when he or they is, or are so admitted, or placed, take the said oaths aforesaid, (the oaths of allegiance and supremacy) and all and every such person and persons so to be admitted, as aforesaid, shall also receive the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, according to the usage of the church of England, within three months after his or their admittance in, or receiving their said authority and employment, in some public church, upon some Lord's day, commonly called Sunday, immediately after divine service and sermon.”—The ninth section requires “of the persons concerned in this act, at the same time when they take the aforesaid oaths of supremacy and allegiance, to make and subscribe the declaration following, under the same penalties and forfeitures as before are appointed. I, A. B. do declare, that I do believe there is not any transubstantiation in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, or in the elements of bread and wine, at, or after the consecration thereof, by any person whatsoever.”—As my argument is adapted to the situation of persons of every persuasion, who can be benefited by the repeal of the Test Acts, I will for brevity sake consider the Catholics as the *only* people interested.—The King, by his admitting those who hold contrary tenets to the doctrines he is bound to maintain, into his cabinet and into the senate, (and such admission is the extent of the effect expected by the repeal of the acts above cited) does not positively weaken the security of the Protestant church; virtually he may decrease the influence of the Protestants by communicating to others, of a different persuasion, the privileges formerly enjoyed by those of the established church only. But though the opening a door to the friends of a different church may decrease the influence of the Protestants in matters of state, it does not necessarily even interfere in their spiritual concerns, and therefore does not diminish the privileges of the bishops and clergy, or of the churches committed to their charge.—Should, however, such an interference be dreaded, restrictions, as to the number of Catholics to be admitted, either into the senate or the cabinet, may prevent the probability of danger to the established church, or disturbance to the minds of His Majesty's

good subjects.—His Majesty and the country have long enjoyed the loyal services of Catholics in the national fleets and armies; and no danger to the church or state has occurred thereby; but by a strict interpretation of the 25 Ch. II. c. 2. such services were contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided.—It may be said, that, in future times, a king less anxious for the welfare of his people, less watchful for the preservation of the established church, than our beloved Sovereign, may repeal the restrictions, and with the greater facility, when the Corporation and Test acts are annulled.—But so it may be said, that hereafter a repeal of the acts in question may take place, and without providing for the security of the Protestant religion, which we have every good reason to suppose, through His Majesty's care, would not be in the least endangered.—But, such arguments relate not to the question; as, the thought of what other kings may do cannot justify His Majesty in the violation of his promise, if the reliefs to the Catholics shall be so construed.—Again: the reason why such oath was imposed on the heirs and successors to the crown of this realm is to be taken into consideration; and, as popery is not so alarming now as when the act containing such oath was enacted, the obligation for strictly watching against Papists is not so strong: and the cause of such statute having ceased, so should the effect: *Cessante causa cecet et effectus*. But, if your patience encourages me, I shall, some other day, trouble you more on this part of my argument, when I come to consider the third objection.—If, however, notwithstanding the strongest arguments which can be offered to His Majesty for the repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts, and no doubt many stronger than any I can presume to propose may be submitted, the King shall still deem such repeal a wound to his conscience, and His Majesty having certainly as much right as any of his subjects to consider the feelings of his heart, the Catholics should with reverence submit, and Protestants must admire the obligation to keep his promise our Sovereign feels himself bound by, as a further proof of His Majesty's religion and virtue, however they regret he cannot persuade himself that such repeal would not be a forfeiture of his pledged word.—With your permission I will send you my thoughts on the remaining objections next week, as I feel that I should take up too much of your time at present.—I remain, Sir, your obedient servant, *BRITANNICUS*.—*Nw. 14th, 1804.*

PRICE OF BREAD AND LABOUR. 1804

[The following letter was received a few days after the publication of an article (in the Register, p. 235 *et seq.*) upon the subject of prices, particularly the price of bread.]

SIR,——You are certainly misinformed with respect to the prices of labour. They have been reduced according to the prices of corn, and as low as they were previous to the great scarcity. As provisions become dearer, they will rise again without any difficulty. They are always kept in proportion to the value of the bushel of corn, and the farmers on one hand, and the men themselves on the other, take care to lower and raise them continually. Task work has gone on as usual with able men, but the common labourer has had only his 9s. a week, and nothing of idleness has arisen from the cheapness of bread, and largeness of wages.—I think it is the duty of the minister to provide for the people, at as easy a rate as possible, and I heartily hope that the harvests abroad are such as to allow of great importations, and that such importations will be made accordingly. Our own harvest will fall short of the expectations that might fairly have been formed of it six weeks ago, though, I believe, it will not be by any means so generally deficient as it is supposed. The farmers will take care to avail themselves of the prevalent idea of blight and mildew, to raise the prices, more for the gratification of their own pampered ways of life, than according to the real value of the grain, from the stock in hand, and yield of the year. I will allow every man to make a fair profit, and according to his capital, but the prime necessities of life are not, and ought not to be, articles of speculation; and the increased expenses in a great farmer's manner of living, notwithstanding all the increased rents put upon him, sufficiently prove that his gains are superabundant.—I rather hope that the operation of the corn bill will be in favour of the consumers, as exportation must now be out of the question, and importation may be encouraged; and, ignorant as the lower classes are, they cannot, therefore, imagine that corn will be carried out of the country, when a larger price can be obtained for it at home. The connexion which they will perversely make between war and scarcity, and peace and plenty, is mischievous enough; but, you do Mr. Pitt, in my mind, great injustice, in supposing that they will be influenced by any such senseless cry.—I think you overstrain your arguments, in stating that so much mischief will be done to the poor man from general enclosures. I

suppose, you advert to his right of common, which in nine cases out of ten is of no manner of use to him, and only leads him to expense in keeping a half starved unprofitable cow. And, I think, you would do more fairly to attribute the enormous poor rates to the mismanagement, and overgrown state of the great farmers.—With respect to tithes, the Church has a very small part of the tithes of the kingdom, compared with the lay holders of them, and generally speaking, very few clergymen in a district can be found who take their tithes in kind. It is, I suppose, only against the latter that any outcry can be made by a pompous and stupid Board of Agriculture, for in all cases of composition for tithes, I cannot see how any stop is put to improvement; and as to any increase of scarcity, the clergyman can want no more than he consumes, and must dispose of the remainder.—I would by no means have the clergy placed upon any variable income, nor made dependant either upon government or farmers, upon any principle that is to be settled by either of them. The clergy have a fair and full right to their tithes, and to any increase in the value of land. If government should choose to be at the expense of having a general survey made throughout the kingdom every five years, and enforce the bishops to settle the value of every living in that period, according to the price of corn taken according to an average, on the 24th of December, with the known value of other tithe articles added to it, possibly the clergy might not object to such a plan; and, I do not see that any mischief might arise from it. But, I quite agree with you in reprobating any exchange of security, and dependance upon funds for their support.—I am, &c. &c. P.—*Rumsey, August 14, 1804.*

CONQUERED COLONIES.

SIR,—In the discussions, which have lately taken place. On the subject of the slave trade, it appears to me that many opinions existed. Some thought the trade should be immediately abolished; some thought it should never be abolished; some thought it should be suspended during the continuance of hostilities; and some that it should not be suspended at all.—But I have never yet heard of any opinion, that the trade should be carried on, if not exclusively, yet preferably, for the benefit of our enemies.—I read in the *Star* of Saturday, Nov 3d, account of arrivals of four vessels, viz. the *Lady Hobart*, *Nicholson*, *Mary*, and *Prince*, at Demerara, from Africa. Sir, at the time when by the treaty of Amiens,

this settlement was to have been given up by us to the Dutch, I was informed on what I apprehend was very unquestionable authority, that this settlement alone had been improved, while, in our possession, by the expenditure of British capital to the enormous amount of *two millions sterling*.—Now, Sir, as there is always a probability, and indeed a general expectation, that, at the conclusion of hostilities, the greater part, if not the whole, of the captured colonies, in the Western hemisphere, will be restored to their former masters, I beg leave, through your Register, to call the public attention to the most outrageous impolicy of suffering a very large portion of British capital to be employed in a channel, the ultimate outlet of which will be exclusively into the coffers of a foreign, not to say a hostile nation. Sir, I should regard this consideration as of sufficient magnitude and force, but others of still greater are behind. Not only is our capital thus immediately misapplied, but, consequentially, it tends to enable foreigners to undersell our own subjects, and, which is of still greater moment, by augmenting their West-Indian trade (by far the most prolific parent and fostering nurse of a navy) it puts into their hands the means of rivaling us in that force, to superiority in which alone we must look for the protection of every thing worth preserving.—Not only our high place in the scale of nations, but our very existence as an independent nation.—Therefore, Sir, without entering into the *verata questio* of the abolition of the slave-trade, I do hope and trust, that immediately on the meeting of parliament measures will be taken to prohibit the carrying it on to any of those places, the whole of which are the property of foreigners and enemies.—I am, &c. &c. X, X.—14th Nov. 1804.

IRISH VOLUNTEERS.

SIR,—The panegyrists of our volunteer system have been in the habit of appealing triumphantly to the supposed exploits of the Irish yeomanry, in the rebellion of 1798. They have attributed the suppression of that rebellion principally to the valour and alertness of the armed yeomanry corps, and hence they argue for the efficiency of an army so constituted in this country. But, Sir, this triumph rests solely upon a "*suggestio falsi*." It is true that there were yeomanry corps, and that there was a rebellion in Ireland; but it does not follow that the one either suppressed or promoted the other. In fact, those corps were of little or no service in action; they frequently fled before equal numbers of peasants. Those British

officers, who then served in Ireland, will attest this fact. The rebellion was put down, partly by the British Fencible regiments stationed there, partly by the conciliating conduct of Lord Cornwallis, and partly by the disunion and mismanagement of the rebels themselves.—The nature and extent of the services of the yeomanry corps, in that perilous crisis, may be sufficiently ascertained by a perusal of an interesting "History of the Rebellion in the County of Wexford, in 1798," published by Mr. HAY, an eye witness, and a gentleman of very ancient family in that county, who writes with a justness of thought and feeling that stamps respect upon his narrative. I shall instance the evacuation of Wexford, on the 30th of May, 1798.—"The military force on that day in Wexford," says Mr. Hay, p. 99, "consisted of 300 of the North Cork militia, commanded by Colonel Foote; 200 of the Donegal militia, under Colonel Maxwell; five troops of yeoman cavalry, viz. those of Wexford, commanded by Capt. Boyd; the Heathfield, by Captain Grogan; the Enniscorthy, by Captain Richards; the Taghmon, by Captain Cox, and the Shilmalier, by Colonel Le Hunte. The yeomen infantry were, those of Wexford, under Doctor Jacob, M. D.; the Enniscorthy, under Captain Pounden; the Scarawalsh, under Captain Cornock; and the Shilmalier, under the Right Honourable George Ogle, with their supplementary men, altogether as many as their original number, and two hundred of the townsmen, amounting in the whole to *twelve hundred men under arms*;" who, "as the town wall was in good condition (indeed Mr. Hay tells us, p. 97, that it was in full preservation), might defy as many thousand assailants, not supported by a great superiority of ordnance.—Thus stood Wexford and its garrison. Now for the valour and the tactics of the latter. They shut themselves closely within the walls, fearing to face an irregular mob of a few thousand peasants, whose weapons were pikes, rusty fire-arms and bayonets, and who did not possess, or know how to use, a single piece of ordnance.—Finding, however, that the rebels did not approach them, they at last sallied out; and Mr. Hay tells us, that "Colonel Maxwell, with 200 of the Donegal militia, and Colonel Watson, with the Shilmalier, Wexford, Enniscorthy, Taghmon, and Heathfield yeomen cavalry," amounting to about 300 men, "resolved to sally out in quest of the enemy. They had advanced as far as Belmont, when

Colonel Watson, eager to reconnoitre, "proceeded up the hill, farther than prudence would permit, and was shot from one of the out posts of the insurgents. The Donegal militia then retreated to Wexford, along with the yeomen cavalry, *who pressed upon them very much along the road!* Immediately after this, a hasty council of war was held, at which it was determined to evacuate the town!!! A general consternation now prevailed, &c. &c."—Thus the death of one man, an English half-pay officer, caused 1200 men to abandon Wexford. Mr. HAY's remark is this:—"The town of Wexford was not only most shamefully abandoned, but even surrendered, to all intents and purposes, when it might have been easily defended, although no one will now acknowledge to have been concerned in so scandalous a transaction; and the very persons who ought to have been its most strenuous protectors, from their situation and circumstances, were not only the first to yield it, and to fly so clandestinely, as to put it utterly out of the power of all others besides themselves to retreat, but left even their own wives and families to the mercy of an irritated and ungovernable multitude."—Had Wexford been defended, and it was certain of relief in 24 hours, from Arklow, Ross, Duncannon fort, and Waterford, all within twenty miles, and garrisoned with upwards of 2000 troops (I do not mean yeomen corps), and had the defence, or rather quiet occupation, of the town been persevered in for three days, it must have been relieved amply from Dublin, only 60 miles distant, where good troops were daily arriving from the north and from England.—Annexed to Mr. Hay's History is a map, which assigns to Wexford a strong military position, partly on a hill, partly flanked by a broad navigable river, very near the sea, and thereby commanding a constant supply of provisions. It formerly withstood obstinate sieges against disciplined armies, and never was deemed untenable, save against the armed peasants, by a volunteer force!—Similar instances are recorded by Mr. HAY, p. 118, 260, 261, and almost *passim*; and his opinion of the yeomanry corps is much confirmed by the Rev. Mr. Gordon, the Protestant historian of the same county, and rector of a parish.—Now, Sir, if it appears incontestably, that the Irish yeomen corps (sharpened against the peasantry, as they certainly were, by political and religious hatred, and of vehement tempers), manifested no superiority, when opposed to a semi-barbarous and semi-armed

rabble; if they appear also to have been driven out of Enniscorthy, another strong hold, with great precipitation, when fairly attacked in the open day; if also the defeats of Captain Adams, Colonel Foote, General Walpole, &c. and the surrender or slaughter of their detachments, inspired them with terror and dismay; if it appears most probable that the armed yeomanry, if unsupported, would have been speedily crushed by the peasantry; if these be facts, surely the example of the Irish yeomanry cannot, with any justice, be cited in support of a similarly constituted force in this country; nor can thinking men rely, with any degree of prudence, upon such a force for protection against the disciplined and regular brigades of Napoleon.—FLAMINIUS... November 1st, 1804.

PUBLIC PAPER.

FRENCH CIRCULAR NOTE. — *Circular Note from M. Talleyrand, French Minister of Foreign Affairs to all the Agents of his Majesty the Emperor of the French.*—Dated Aix-la-Chapelle, Sep. 5, 1804.

You must, Sir, have observed and known, according to my instructions at the time of the communication of the note of Lord Hawkesbury to the Foreign Ministers residing in London, the impression which this publication of the strongest maxims of political and social morality could not fail to produce on the mind of the government with which you reside. I think I ought to return to the subject. I therefore send you, officially, a copy of this note, and expressly charge you, by order of his Majesty, to make it the object of a special conference with the ministry.—The project which the English government has conceived for the last half century, gradually to abolish the tutelary system of public law which unites and engages all civilized nations, develops itself with a fearful progression. Will other governments refrain from making opposition to such an enterprise till there no longer exist any moral bond which may preserve their rights, guarantee their engagements, and protect their interests?—The powers of the Continent have seen with what audacity the faith of oaths has been sported with by this government, and solemn treaties violated, even before they were carried into execution. The maritime nations every day experience its tyranny. There no longer exists any theoretical principle of navigation, any written Convention, which have not been scandalously violated on every shore, and in

every sea. Neutral states know, that even in using the rights which still remain to them with the most timid circumspection, they expose themselves to insult, to pillage, and to extermination. — Those states, in fine, which have the unhappiness to be at war, no more rely on any reciprocal principle of moderation and justice. All the bonds existing between them and the neutral powers are broken. Approach to the coasts and entrance into the ports and islands, though situate at the distance of 200 leagues from the station of their squadrons, have been prohibited by simple proclamation.—Thus the English government has hitherto opposed to every power, according to its particular position, a maxim injurious to its honour, and subversive to all its rights. It now attacks them altogether, and the more completely to attain its end, directs its blow against morality itself, and if I may so speak, against the religion of public law.

(To be continued.)

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

SIR GEORGE RUMBOLD. (Continued from p. 782) This gentleman has, since the last Register was published, arrived in London.—On his arrival at Paris, he was conveyed to the Temple, where he was treated with civility, and where he remained two days and two nights. On the third day he was removed from the Temple, and conveyed towards the coast of the channel, having first signed a parole, that he would not return to Hamburgh, nor, after his departure from France, go within fifty miles of any part of the French territories. Before he left the Temple, he made an application for his papers, which were in the hands of the minister of the police; but, this demand was peremptorily refused. Thus stripped of his diplomatic character as well as his documents, he was put into a carriage with his servant, and conveyed first to Boulogne, where he remained a day or two. Thence he was taken to Cherbourg, where he was put on board of a flag of truce, on Thursday, the 15th instant. This vessel fell in with his Majesty's frigate the Niobe, where Sir George was taken on board. He landed at Portsmouth on Saturday, the 17th instant, and came to London on Sunday.—The release of Sir George Rumbold has, by the ministerial papers, been ascribed, in great part, if not entirely, to the remonstrances, not to say threats, of the King of Prussia, who, we are told, upon bearing of the act of violence committed

upon our minister to Hamburgh, immediately dispatched a courier to General Knoblesdorff (who had just set out for Paris for the purpose of assisting at the coronation, and of presenting thereupon the congratulations of his master) to prevent him from appearing in his friendly capacity, until an explanation was given relative to the seizure of the British minister. One of these writers adds: "the King of Prussia also sent for his *best* general, the Duke of Brunswick, and the Elector of Hesse Cassel, who, in addition to his talents as a general, can furnish a considerable auxiliary army!" Another writer told us of "the sensation which the whole Continent, not excepting the Batavian republic, had experienced on this occasion;" while a third had the "inexpressible happiness to congratulate a generous and enlightened people upon the important occurrence which had, at last, humbled the haughty tyrant, and prepared the way for his speedy overthrow."

—Though I was very willing to count myself amongst the "enlightened people," I was much afraid, that the congratulations of our friend in the Morning Post were somewhat premature; and, I think, my apprehensions are now nearly confirmed. The French papers do, indeed, allow, that Sir George Rumbold was released in consequence of the interference of Prussia. This is plainly stated in the Moniteur of the 11th instant, in the following words. "Mr. Rumbold, the English Agent at Hamburgh, arrested within cannon shot of the advanced post of the French army of Hanover, and carried to Paris, has been liberated through the protection of the King of Prussia, and has been sent to England by the way of Cherbourg. If the proceedings against this worthy associate of Drake, Spencer Smith, and Taylor, had been completed, they would have furnished instances as remarkable as those of his accomplices."—Yet, if the release of Sir George Rumbold had been demanded by the King of Prussia, and, especially in the manner which has been described; if that Monarch had really been preparing for war; if he had, in good earnest, sent for his "*best* general" upon the occasion; if he had, at last, drawn forth his trusty though rusty weapon, and sworn to obtain reparation for the wrong; if this had been the case, it is hard to discover a reason why Sir George Rumbold should be obliged to leave his papers behind him, and also to sign a parole not to return to the

court whence he was taken, nor even to go within fifty miles of the French territory! It has been said, that this article in the Moniteur clearly proves that Buonaparté yielded with reluctance to the application of Prussia; that he has acted under the influence of terror; that the demand of Prussia has been peremptory; that Buonaparté has been forced to relinquish his prey by a superior power. But, to this there is an objection, which one would be very glad to see removed; to wit; if the above-quoted article in the Moniteur does so clearly show all this, how came it to be inserted in the Moniteur? After all that we have been told, and truly told, about the French press, which is not exceeded, in point of respectfulness, even by that of Calcutta, or of Dublin; after we have, for years, regarded the articles in the Moniteur as being all sanctioned, if not actually written or dictated, by persons in the French government; after all this, it will hardly be suggested, that the above article found its way into print without the consent or knowledge of that government. Indeed, the writer alluded to proceeds upon the contrary supposition; for, he represents the article as the "growling and foaming" of Buonaparté himself. To what, then, short of downright insanity, can we possibly ascribe the publication of an article by Buonaparté, which article is "a proof," that he has yielded to the peremptory demands of Prussia, that he has relinquished his prey to a superior power, that he has acted under the influence of terror? One of two positions admit not of dispute: either Napoleon is mad, or he did not think that the article in question contained any such "proof" as that we have been speaking of; and, I must confess, that my opinion inclines to the latter. He certainly did not think that this article would convey any proof of his having acted under the influence of terror; nor, indeed, does it, as far as I can perceive. Different persons see the same act in different lights; but, I see nothing in the conduct of the French government, upon this occasion, that indicates any fear at all; and, perhaps, the yielding, in appearance, to the wish of Prussia, in a certain degree, was intended merely to silence those, who were daily representing Prussia as being the vassal, and as existing by the suzerainty of France. It may be regarded as seeing with glass eyes; but, it would not at all surprize me, if this apparent concession made to Prussia was chiefly intended to give consequence to that power in comparison to Russia; and further, to

make the congratulation of Prussia upon the approaching coronation appear as the act of a powerful and perfectly independent monarchy. By insisting upon keeping the papers of Sir George Rumbold, and, more especially by taking his parole, Buonaparté adheres to and acts upon the principle laid down in the circular note of Talleyrand (see p. 819); and, by stating demi-officially, in the *Moniteur*, that Sir George Rumbold has been personally set at liberty at the request of the King of Prussia, the purpose of giving consequence to Prussia and of rescuing her from the charge of abject dependence is, in some degree, affected.—This is the light, in which I view the transaction. I wish my opinion may prove erroneous; I wish that Prussia may have resolved to obtain a retraction of the principle adopted by the French and promulgated in the above-mentioned circular note; but, from every thing that has yet transpired, there is but too much reason to fear, that Prussia will push the matter no farther.—If we had an *army*, indeed, to send to the continent; then might we with some reason call upon Prussia to take up arms. But, we have none; and, therefore, however “honest” we may be, and however roguish we may think the powers of the continent, we can hardly expect them to begin a war for Sir George Rumbold, as the Greeks did for Helen, especially after he has been given up.—The French circular note really interdicts all our ministers upon the continent. The ground of this interdiction, is, that Lord Hawkesbury, in his note of the 30th of April, 1804, asserts the right of employing diplomatic agents in stirring up the revolt in states, with which their country is at war, they themselves residing, at the same time, at neutral courts. So far the statement of the “solid young lord’s” doctrine is correct; but, Talleyrand insinuates, this statesman of ours has contended for the right of employing our diplomatic agents, so situated, in furthering the purposes of assassination. This is false. No such right is contended for; though, as was stated, and I think proved, at the time, the note of Lord Hawkesbury, in talking about *aiding the people of France against an usurper* was not easily to be reconciled with the peace and “amity,” which he had negotiated and, in his majesty’s name, concluded with that usurper.*—The ministerial papers are

* See this subject discussed, Register, Vol. 5, p. 688, and seq.

now affecting to treat the correspondence of Mehée and Mr. Drake as a “fabrication,” not recollecting, perhaps, that Lord Hawkesbury never denied its authenticity, but that, on the contrary, he supposed a case like that of Mr. Drake, and defended (as well as he could!) such conduct in a person so situated. It is rather too broad, therefore, for the partisans of ministers now to call Mr. Drake’s letters “a fabrication.” But, the truth is, that the circular letter of Lord Hawkesbury does give but too much countenance to the charge now preferred by the French, as will, I think, clearly appear to any one, who will take the trouble to read the pages of vol. V. just referred to. First to make a treaty of “amity” with a man; solemnly to pledge yourself to discourage all attempts to disturb his government; to receive from him territories belonging to his allies; to regard these territories as your own for ever; and, after all this, the moment you quarrel with him, to turn round short upon him, declare him an usurper and not entitled to the same treatment as other sovereigns or chiefs of nations; this was something which could not fail to shock the world. It does not justify the measures now taken by Buonaparté; but, it gives a fatal countenance to those measures.—The doctrine laid down by Lord Hawkesbury, in the above-mentioned letter, relative to the seizure and detention of the English prisoners in France is, by a correspondent of mine, disputed, particularly as it applies to the case of Sir James Crauford. There is not room to insert his remarks at present, but they shall be inserted in my next; for, it is, in this, as in all other cases, *truth* that I am seeking to establish.

MR. CANNING AND LORD HAWKESBURY.—Upon the subject of the note which appeared in the preceding sheet, p. 783, I have been told that I am deceived; and, that it is Mr. Canning who has acted the submissive part, and not his lordship. But, barely telling either me or the public this appears by no means satisfactory. We know; all the world knows, that, in the debate of the 18th of June last, Mr. Canning did say: “I shall content myself with vindicating my own consistency. I objected to the administration of foreign affairs, and *that has been changed*.” Nothing could be plainer than this. The words admit of no palliation. They have a clear meaning, and only that meaning. Lord Hawkesbury had, at the time when Mr. Canning made the above declaration, actually been removed from the administration

of foreign affairs; and, the conclusion is, that he had been removed in consequence of Mr. Canning's objection to him. Nobody finds any fault with his removal: no; that were indeed to discover a most unreasonable propensity to censure; but, every one may be allowed to admire the hereditary patriotism and "self-devotedness" which have induced his lordship to continue in office under such circumstances. He sees the state in danger, and nothing can make him desert his post. Glorious example! Why should it not be followed by Lord Grenville, Mr. Fox, and even by the Prince himself? That is to say, if Mr. Canning has no "objection" to them!

MINISTERIAL INTRIGUES.—(Continued from page 800). Before I proceed to consider the consequences of such a coalition as that which the ministerial writers seem to wish for, it is necessary to notice, and to quote at full length, an article, which, upon this subject, appeared in the newspaper called the *SUN*, of the 20th instant, and which evidently comes from some one of those who are deeply interested in the success of the intrigues, which the ministers have been carrying on for a week or two past: "We have scarcely been more gratified in the satisfaction we have felt at the reconciliation which has taken place in the Royal Family than we have been amused with the comments which the Opposition have made upon this happy event. —We were certainly induced to consider this fortunate circumstance as a most important occurrence for the country, without any reference whatever to party—but the fears which one party betrays would almost lead us to doubt whether we viewed it in a proper light.—When Mr. E—— runs about Westminster Hall, assuring every body "upon his honour that party "has nothing to do with it," we are almost tempted to ask him, as a professional man, whether there is a more common ground of suspicion than an eagerness to disprove that which has never been advanced? The opposition writers too cannot refer to the subject without suffering their fears to press out—they cannot touch upon it without a mixture of abuse upon Mr. Pitt. Now it is very proper and very natural for them to abuse him with a reference to his political measures, but to abuse him with a reference to that which they affect to approve, can only draw from us a smile. —The Prince of Wales, we believe, possesses the best dispositions; but it is not uncommon for those who possess such

dispositions to listen too much to those who entertain very opposite feelings. We have before asserted, that the Prince cannot become a party man without degrading himself. We should be as sorry to see him the partisan of Mr. Pitt, as of Mr. Fox or Mr. Sheridan—nay, we will go further, we cannot countenance the supposition that he is so, without his name being used for purposes which he would be the first to condemn. He can only obviate this, and place himself where he ought to stand in the opinion of the country, by shewing, by his public conduct, that he is no party-man. If he has ever in any degree so considered himself, those who have advised him to it have given bad counsel; but of this we are sure, that he has never gone those lengths in any party cause which those who have thought they might profit by it have chosen to represent.—And here we discover the cause of that anxiety on the part of the Opposition which we have noticed above. Some of its members may have discovered that they cannot now so freely use the name of the Prince as the engine of party, in which way he may be sure it has been employed much to his disadvantage. If he knew to what purposes that name has been committed—what promises it has been supposed to sanction, we are persuaded he would not disagree with us in our opinion upon this point. He would feel that this opinion is not actuated by political adherence to any men, but by attachment to the constitution, loyalty to our Sovereign, and, as a part of the same feeling, by a deep anxiety for the character, the honour, and the welfare of every person belonging to his august family, and particularly of the Heir Apparent of the throne.—We believe that upon this happy occasion the Prince has consulted his own feelings, and has employed that good sense which he is known to possess. If he has looked back into history, he may have seen that differences between Father and Son, in the instances of persons situated as he is, have seldom so much arisen from the feelings of the parties themselves as they have been fomented by interested individuals; that by such differences nothing has been gained to the persons immediately concerned, but that all have been sufferers. If any such reflection has arisen in his mind, he cannot fail to have applied it with peculiar force to his own case. He has a father, endeared to the nation by a

"most virtuous life; by a mild, just, and
 "beneficent reign; with whose afflictions
 "his subjects have deeply sympathized,
 "and whose happiness has always been an
 "object nearest to their hearts.—In-
 "fluenced by such considerations, the
 "Prince of Wales must have felt himself
 "actuated by the strongest private and
 "public motives to a cordial reconciliation
 "with his Royal Father; and his Majesty's
 "kind and benevolent feelings must have
 "created a similar wish and anxiety on his
 "part. If Mr. Pitt and Lord Moira (as
 "we understand) have been principally
 "instrumental in producing this union,
 "they deserve the thanks of the nation.
 "Every good man will wish to cement it.
 "None will endeavour to disturb it, except
 "those who, to serve selfish and party pur-
 "poses, are regardless of the best interests
 "of the country."—This writer has in
 view to disguise the feelings of disappoint-
 ment now experienced by the minister and
 his expecting adherents, who were eagerly
 looking forward to the renewal of a long
 lease of their power and emoluments. —
 He unquestionably points at Mr. ER-
 SKINE in the blank after the letter E; and,
 it is with peculiar delicacy that he appears
 to treat with contempt the idea of Mr.
 Erskine's *honour*, after having, only a few
 days before, expressed his anxious desire to
 see that gentleman's "powerful aid brought
 "to the government in the great council of
 "the nation." But, where shall we look
 for assurance equal to that, which has led
 this writer to discover the fears of the op-
 position, in their "eagerness to disprove
 "that which has never been advanced?" That
 which has never been advanced! Why,
 was it not advanced, on the second day
 after the reconciliation took place, that this
 reconciliation was to lead (and immedi-
 ately too) to political consequences? Was it
 not rumoured first, then reported, then said,
 and then asserted, that Lord Moira had ac-
 tually accepted the post of Lord Lieutenant
 of Ireland? Is not this notorious to all the
 world? Was it not advanced, in the pas-
 sages of a ministerial paper, quoted in the
 Register of last week, that "from the im-
 "mediate *parliamentary* friends of the
 "Prince an active and cordial co-opera-
 "tion in the affairs of the state might rea-
 "sonably be looked for?" Were not Lord
 Moira, Mr. Erskine, and Mr. Sheridan par-
 ticularly mentioned as persons, who, in
 consequence of the royal reconciliation, were
 about to join the minister? And, there-
 fore, was it, on the part of Mr. Erskine, for

instance, "an eagerness to disprove that
 "which had never been advanced?"—
 The opposition writers cannot refrain from
 "suffering their fears to press out." Fears
 of what? Is it possible, then, that the op-
 position writers should express their fears
 of a junction with Mr. Pitt? A fear of
 sharing in the power and emoluments of the
 state? Is the contamination, then, so much
 to be dreaded?—No, Mr. Pitt is not
 censured by the opposition writers for
 having contributed towards the reconcilia-
 tion of the two royal persons so often men-
 tioned, but for endeavouring to make that
 reconciliation the means of raising parlia-
 mentary recruits, and that he has so en-
 deavoured is gathered from the confessions
 of the ministerial writers. The opposition
 writers do not affect to approve, but they
 really do approve, of the conduct of every
 one who has promoted the reconciliation;
 but this approbation is given with the pro-
 viso, that the persons promoting the recon-
 ciliation have had no party, no selfish, pur-
 pose in view.—It is very plausible lan-
 guage to deprecate the idea of the Prince
 becoming "the head of a party," a "party
 "man," and so forth; but, if there be a
 minister of such a domineering disposition
 as to compel a prince to be the head of a
 party, or to be nothing at all but a mere
 pensioner of the state, is a prince, in such
 case, not to seek the only means of support-
 ing his consequence?—As this ministerial
 writer seems to be willing to suffer
 Lord Moira to take a small share with Mr.
 Pitt in the public applause; it is to be hoped
 that his lordship will soon cease to cut so
 conspicuous a figure as he now does in the
 ministerial caricature shop; and, I think,
 too, that *the plume of feathers* might be with-
 drawn from some of the scenes here alluded
 to, since Mr. Pitt has, at last, *condescended*
 not only to make overtures of amity,
 but also for a co-operation with the Prince
 and his friends. Far be it from me to
 blame Mr. Pitt for his anxious desire to gain
 the good will of his Royal Highness. Far,
 very far indeed, be it from me to blame
 him for now showing a becoming degree of
 respect and humility towards the son and
 heir apparent of his Sovereign; for though
 this respect and humility certainly came
 very late, still they are enjoined by duty;
 nor is the labourer of the eleventh hour to
 be envied by those who have borne the heat
 of the day. But, then, this respect and hu-
 mility should be sincere. They should be
 simple. They should flow from repentance
 and not from ambition. They should look

solely
 power
 It wo
 easy t
 timac
 oper
 and u
 which
 the m
 A cor
 in the
 the ac
 rende
 ment
 twenty
 of his
 view
 tering
 necess
 the Pr
 an ins
 so dee
 other
 agains
 if the
 ed to
 gree o
 agains
 their s
 the du
 that w
 given.
 how m
 when i
 tion w
 would
 sentful
 wish to
 politica
 one wh
 prince
 to his I
 in the
 identifi
 and, fu
 that mi
 he did
 the ger
 govern
 The mi
 times
 Prince
 ciliation
 ministe
 pressed
 stamp,
 the pri
 his inhe
 "ment
 is, as is

solely to an oblivion of the past, and not to power, honours and rewards for the future. It would, was this the time and place, be easy to show, that a very close personal intimacy, and more especially a political co-operation, of the Prince and Mr. Pitt would, and must, produce feelings and opinions, which might prove extremely dangerous to the monarchy, and, of course, to the people. A correspondent, whose letter shall appear in the next Register, has taken a view of the account which Mr. Pitt would have to render his Royal Highness of the *improvement* which he has made, during his twenty years administration, in the affairs of his royal master; and a most striking view it is! What, therefore, without entering into detail, we may ask; what must necessarily be the feelings of the nation, if the Prince, by his conduct, were to discover an insensibility as to that which has made so deep an impression upon the minds of all other men? To forgive injuries committed against themselves is becoming in all men, if the party offending show (in a way adapted to the nature of the case) a proper degree of contrition; but, injuries committed against princes are committed also against their subjects; and, it sometimes becomes the duty of a prince to resent politically that which personally he has entirely forgiven. How much stronger is the case, how much more imperious the duty, then, when it is the injuries and disgraces of a nation which are to be forgiven! No one would wish to see the Prince personally resentful towards Mr. Pitt; no one would wish to see him pursue that minister even politically; but, I am persuaded, that no one who sincerely wishes well to either the prince or the monarchy, would recommend to his Royal Highness to do any act, which, in the minds of the people, should tend to identify him with Mr. Pitt and his system; and, further, I think he should do no act, that might cause the people to suppose that he did *not disapprove* of that system: I mean the general system by which Mr. Pitt has governed, and still governs, the country.—The ministerial writer has hinted, that the times are ticklish, and that, therefore, the Prince will do well to hasten to a reconciliation and co-operation with the present minister; which sentiment has been expressed by another writer of the same stamp, who has hinted that the only way for the prince to preserve the throne which is his inheritance, is, “to support the government of his father;” and here *government* is, as is usual in all such cases, put for mi-

nistry. Now my opinion is exactly the contrary of this. Those who think (if any one can think so), that, during the twenty years administration of Mr. Pitt, the nation has lost nothing in its liberties or its glory; those who think that they see honourable, prosperous, and tranquil days approaching under the rule of that gentleman, may, possibly, be justified in recommending to the Prince to embark his political reputation along with Mr. Pitt; but, the same recommendation would certainly not be justifiable in those, who think, as I do, that the system of Mr. Pitt cannot be persevered in without adding to the national disgrace, without a further and further abridgment of its liberties, and without producing, finally, such consequences and events as would shake the throne to its centre.—From the same persuasion it is, that I should dread any such coalition as that pointed at by the Morning Post, It would be truly alarming to see the Prince and his “*parliamentary friends*” (to use the phrase of the ministerial writer) become the partizans of Mr. Pitt and his system; but, if the opposition could be brought over, or divided, there would, at once, be an end of the hopes of all that part of the people, whose hopes tend towards the safety and honour of the country. If the leaders of the opposition, together with the aristocracy, were to suffer themselves to be inveigled into the embraces of Mr. Pitt and his loan-jobbers, the people would either abandon the cause of their country entirely, they would either become totally indifferent as to its fate; or, they would seek for new leaders. They would look for other men to espouse their cause: a new race, quite a new race, of public men would arise; and, the danger would consist in this, that this new race of men would look to, and depend for success *solely upon the people*; the aristocracy having joined the jobbers and ranged themselves under the banners of Mr. Pitt. At first, indeed, supposing the combination to exist for a while, there would be a dead calm. But *events* must come on, and occasions must offer for the creating of the race, of which I have been speaking; and, as to what description that race would be of; what would be their principles and their conduct; what would be the consequences of their endeavours, it is by no means difficult to conjecture. In short, it is my firm persuasion, that, a junction between Mr. Pitt and the leaders of the opposition, he being prime minister, would in-

evitably produce the destruction of the monarchy, if not the subjugation of the country. And, I am not talking of distant consequences. We have any time these two years been told that we are in "the crisis of our fate." When things are come to a crisis, it requires but a short time, and no very great event, to effect a total change. Three or four years would be quite sufficient; and the quartern loaf at half-a-crown; a sudden and great degradation of the paper-money, or some such circumstance, would be more than enough to put an end at once to all our hopes and our fears.—[This subject shall be resumed in my next.]

THE MAN OF NO PARTY.—In a poem, published a few years ago, from under the pen of Mr. Canning and others, the French atheist, LEPEAU was emphatically styled, "*the man without a God.*" As Lepeau was in religion, nearly such is, as to political matters, "*a man without a party.*" On this subject I have selected, from SWIFT, some excellent sentiments, as a motto to the present sheet. The selection has been made from the 45th EXAMINER. The whole passage is so good, and at this time so well worthy of the attention of every man in the country, *from the peasant even to the prince*, that I cannot refrain from inserting it entire. "Whoever calls himself a man of no party, you may depend upon it is of a party; but, it is such a party as he is ashamed to own. For even while he says he is of no party, you may observe from the whole drift of his discourse, that he is plainly prejudiced in favour of one party, and that too always the worst. And the true reason of his not declaring is, that he thinks the party not yet strong enough to protect him. The justice of the cause, or the goodness of the intention, seems to be out of this gentleman's scheme. The only distinction he goes by is, to be professedly of no party, that he may occasionally be of either. Others there are, who are really of a party, and don't know it; they carry on designs which are kept a secret from them; and these indeed are such insignificant tools of a party, that they may properly enough be said to be of no party: they are machines purely passive: and, without any will of their own, obey the impulse of the wheel that moves them. But you shall never hear a man of true principles say

"he's a man of no party; he declares he is of a party, if resolutely to stand by and defend the constitution both in Church and State, must be called being of a party. But the other party, it seems, is to be divided into two sorts; those who are of that party, and those who are of no party at all. With the gentlemen who apply this latter expression to themselves, I would beg leave to reason thus: either they are of a party, or they are not; if they are, they prevaricate grossly (not to use a more unmannerly expression), while they give out the contrary. If they are not, they ought to be ashamed of such an infamous neutrality, and of deserting that cause which they are bound in honour and conscience to defend."—Your man of no party is generally furnished very liberally with impudence as well as hypocrisy; and, as to his political character, he is by turns, a brutal demagogue and a smooth-tongued sycophant. None better than he knows how to wheedle the sovereign people, or to flatter the ear of his prince. He changes oftener than the weather, and no change, however sudden or great ever raises a blush upon his cheek; and, the only justification he ever thinks it worth his while to put forward, is that he has altered his opinion, without ever being able to give any one reason from which such alteration has arisen. The fundamental maxim of his creed, is, that the end sanctifies the means; the end of which he never, for one moment, loses sight, is, his own private interest; and, in pursuing this, he boggles at nothing. He is generally a second rate man in point of talents, and of the very lowest rate of all in point of birth and family connexion. Such and so situated as to make him look downwards with insolent pride, and upwards with envy and hatred.

I wished very much to make some observations upon the *prices of provisions*, particularly by way of answer to a correspondent in a former part of this sheet.—The further *Prorogation of Parliament* would, too, afford matter for comment. My readers may be assured, that it is to be ascribed to any thing rather than a *full treasury*, three quarters of the civil-list being already behind hand again!—No; it is in order to try once more the chapter of accidents. The intention of the former *Prorogation*, was, to endeavour to *strengthen the ministry* before the Parliament opened.

"Mr. d
"old cr
"gran
"can, b
"donab
"well-e
"ted tal
833]

SIR.—
that tre
"a peac
with mo
"superf
seemed t
at peace
"experi
them of
men of
the actu
say, her
places so
posal, tog
from Cu
her gove
law but
means bu
her peop
recompen
which th
than the
nations;
every par
mouth of
of immine
danger to
all are de
hope for
impossibl
The first
parté sho
tillas desti
try; and
him dispos
There is,
appears to
impossibil
of making
impression
that she i
single-han
to assist th
the yoke o
trade by c
on by land
to perplex
it is deni